



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,634	10/24/2003	Daniel P. Brown	CS21907RA	8650
20280	7590	06/27/2007	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA INC			HUANG, WEN WU	
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45				
ROOM AS437			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343			2618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/692,634	BROWN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Wen W. Huang	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2007.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/18/07 has been entered.

Claims 13-24 are cancelled.

Claims 1-12 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Petite (US. 5,926,103; hereinafter "Petite").

Regarding **claim 1**, Petite teaches a method for a wireless communication device (see Petite, fig. 1, portable transmitter 120) to provide information about an incident (see Petite, col. 1, lines 61-66), the method comprising:

detecting an activation input (see Petite, col. 3, lines 56-62, a plurality of buttons 210) associated with an incident event (see Petite, col. 4, lines 2-4);

scanning (see Petite, fig. 2, transmitter 230, col. 10-15) for at least one remote device (see Petite, fig. 1, transceiver 130; col. 6, lines 41-43);

coordinating collection of data (see Petite, col. 4, lines 2-4 and 32-40) by the wireless communication device with the at least one remote device by associating the collected data with the incident (see Petite, col. 4, lines 49-54 and col. 8, lines 6-10);

recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Petite, col. 5, lines 28-29), the data being obtained by at least one video sensor of the at least one remote device (see Petite, fig. 1, camera 150); and

transmitting the recorded data to a designated location (see Petite, col. 6, lines 10-11, col. 7, lines 57-66 and col. 8, lines 7-10).

Regarding **claim 2**, Petite also teaches the method of claim 1, wherein coordinating collection of data with the at least one remote device includes informing the at least one remote device about the designated location (see Petite, col. 4, col. 2-4 and 56-58, and col. 5, lines 45-55; the function code designates one of several locations for different types of emergencies).

Regarding **claim 3**, Petite also teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving authorization to utilize data obtained by the at least one remote device (see Petite, col. 5, lines 42-46).

Regarding **claim 4**, Petite also teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising identifying subject matter of the incident event based on the activation input (see Petite, col. 3, lines 56-66).

Regarding **claim 5**, Petite also teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: retrieving previously recorded data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Petite, col. 6, lines 24-36); and transmitting the previously recorded data to the designated location (see Petite, col. 6, lines 38-40).

Regarding **claim 6**, Petite also teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: scanning for the at least one remote device including scanning via a wireless local area network (see Petite, col. 6, lines 41-43); and transmitting the recorded data to a designated location includes transmitting via a cellular communication system (see Petite, col. 6, lines 20-22).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petite in view of Hanninen et al. (US. 7,058,409 B2; hereinafter “Hanninen”).

Regarding claim 7, Petite teaches a method for a wireless communication device (see Petite, fig. 1, transceiver 130) to provide information about an incident (see Petite, col. 1, lines 61-66), the method comprising:

detecting, from a remote mobile device (see Petite, fig. 1, portable transmitter 120), a request signal associated with an incident event (see Petite, col. 4, lines 2-4 and 49-54);

receiving information from the remote mobile device about a designated location (see Petite, col. 4, col. 2-4 and 56-58, and col. 5, lines 45-55; the function code designates one of several locations for different types of emergencies);

recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Petite, col. 5, lines 28-29 and col. 8, lines 7-10), the data being obtained by at least one video sensor (see Petite, fig. 1, camera 150);

transmitting the recorded data to the designated location (see Petite, col. 6, lines 10-11 and col. 7, lines 57-66),

Petite is silent to teaching that recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event in response to detecting the request signal or receiving the information about the designated location from the remote mobile device. However, the claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Hanninen.

In the same field of endeavor, Hanninen teaches recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Hanninen, col. 4, lines 61-62) in response to detecting the request signal or receiving the information about the designated location from the remote mobile device (see Hanninen, col. 3, lines 57-58 and col. 5, lines 12-18).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Petite and the teaching of Hanninen in order to provide a useful record of crimes and accidents (see Hanninen, col. 1, lines 19-25).

Regarding **claim 8**, the combination of Petite and Hanninen also teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising identifying subject matter of the incident event based on video characteristics received from the remote device (see Hanninen, col. 5, lines 8-11).

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination of Petite and Hanninen also teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising providing authorization to the remote device to utilize the recorded data (see Petite, col. 5, lines 42-46).

Regarding **claim 10**, the combination of Petite and Hanninen also teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising:

identifying subject matter of the incident event based on the request signal (see Petite, col. 4, lines 2-5 and 56-58; Hanninen, col. 4, lines 45-50); and  
requesting more information from the remote device if the subject matter cannot be clearly identified (see Hanninen, col. 5, lines 4-6).

Regarding **claim 11**, the combination of Petite and Hanninen also teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising:

retrieving previously recorded data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Petite, col. 6, lines 24-36); and  
transmitting the previously recorded data to the designated location (see Petite, col. 6, lines 38-40).

Regarding **claim 12**, the combination of Petite and Hanninen also teaches the method of claim 7, wherein transmitting the recorded data to a designated location includes transmitting via a wireless communication system (see Petite, col. 6, lines 20-23).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hackett et al. (US. 5,926,210) teaches a mobile security system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen W. Huang whose telephone number is (571) 272-7852. The examiner can normally be reached on 10am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on (571) 272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

wwh  
MM  
6/21/07



MATTHEW ANDERSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER